

00862.023128.

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
	:	Examiner: P.K. Huntsinger
TSUYOSHI MIMA)	
	:	Art Unit: 2625
Application No.: 10/609,369)	
	:	Conf. No.: 1190
Filed: July 1, 2003)	
	:	
For: IMAGE PROCESSING APPARATUS)	
WHICH SCANS LOCATION	:	
INFORMATION TO AUTHENTICATE)	
PRINTING AN ORIGINAL IMAGE	:	November 30, 2009

Mail Stop: RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Sir:

Applicant's attorneys have received the Examiner's Interview Summaries mailed on September 30, and November 23, 2009, and generally concur with the comments therein, but wish to submit the following additional comments.

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-WEB TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically by EFS-Web transmission to the United States Patent Office on:

November 30, 2009
(Date of Transmission)

Christian Mannino, Reg. No. 58,373
(Name of Attorney for Applicant)

/Christian Mannino/
Signature

November 30, 2009
Date of Signature

On September 21, 2009, a telephonic interview was conducted between Applicant's undersigned attorney and Examiner Huntsinger to discuss the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in the Office Action of June 9, 2009, Applicant's attorney emphasized that nothing has been found in U.S. Patent 6,972,863 (Parry) that is believed to teach or suggest at least the feature of "setting means for automatically setting, in accordance with an authentication by said authentication means, a destination for the original image of the document to an address of the user authenticated by said authentication means, the set destination being different from said image processing apparatus" as recited in Claim 1, presented in the Amendment of September 9, 2009.

Applicant's attorney discussed the Examiner's interpretation of the phrase "automatically setting" in the context of the arguments presented in the Amendment of September 9, 2009. During the interview the Examiner clarified his position in the Final Office Action of June 9, 2009 and suggested that Applicant amend Claim 1 to further define the setting means, and in particular, the feature of automatically setting. Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed possible amendments to further define the setting means of Claim 1. One proposed amendment was to amend the recitation "setting means for automatically setting, ..., a destination for the original image" in Claim 1 to --setting means for automatically setting, ..., a predetermined destination for the original image--. Another proposed amendment was to amend the recitation "setting means for automatically setting, ..., a destination for the original image" in Claim 1 to --setting means for

automatically setting without manual designation by the user, ..., a destination for the original image--. The Examiner tentatively stated the proposed amendments to Claim 1 would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Nonetheless, Applicant has not adopted either of those proposed amendments to Claim 1 in the aforementioned Preliminary Amendment.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Examiner clarified the rejection at paragraph 3 of the Final Office Action of June 9, 2009. The Examiner suggested amending the recitation “authentication means for authenticating whether a user can utilize an original image of the document” in Claim 1 to --authentication means for authenticating a user--. Applicant has adopted the Examiner’s suggested claim language in the aforementioned Preliminary Amendment.

On November 19, 2009, a further telephone interview was conducted between Applicant’s undersigned attorney and Examiner Huntsinger to discuss possible claim amendments to Claim 1 to further define the claimed setting means. The Examiner indicated that the proposed claim language (repeated in the Interview Summary) would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christian Mannino/
Christian Mannino
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,373

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4199915v1